REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed on February 6, 2007, Applicant(s) respectfully request(s) reconsideration.

Claim(s) 1, 4-10, 12-17, 20-24, 26-29, 31-32 and 34-37 are now pending in this Application.

Claim(s) claims 1, 17, 31, 32, 34 and 35 are independent claims and the remaining claims are dependent claims.

In this Amendment, claim(s) claims 1, 17, 31, 32, 34 and 35 have been amended Applicant(s) believe that the claim(s) as presented are in condition for allowance. A notice to this affect is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects, inter alia, claim 31 based on Woodmansee '140 (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0178140) in view of Myhrvold '166 (U.S. Patent No. 5,867,166) and Cuckson '646 (U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0193646). Applicant(s) respectfully disagree(s) with these contentions and assert that the present claimed invention is not anticipated by any disclosure in the cited references. Applicant herein presents a brief further amendment to place the claims in proper form for allowance.

Myhrvold is specifically cited for the proposition that Myhrvold teaches the claimed step of:

> *processing, by a sort handler, during the second pass, the computed subset of candidate entries according to the determined output criteria to generate complete entries of the entries in the candidate set, wherein the parsed entries of the second pass require substantially less memory than the first pass such that the parsed entries of the second pass are stored simultaneously in memory,*

Myhrvold '166, however, is inapplicable to the present invention because Myhrvold is directed to a graphics processing system and employs a rendered graphical (i.e. pixel) oriented output, not a tabular report of statistical SAN data of SAN manageable entities, as recited in claim 31. The rendering function of Myhrvold pertains to transformations for graphics processing, such as layering

(the cited gsprites), anti-aliasing, and chunking (cols. 7-10, generally). Accordingly one of skill in the art would not look to Myhrvold to modify Woodmansee '140 because Myhrvold pertains to image processing, for which rendering encompasses substantially complex mathematical transformations and convolutions.

Further, even if one were to apply Myhrvold '166 to Woodmansee '140 and Cuckson, the present invention would still not be realized. The disclosed invention makes two passes of the same data set, in which the first spans partial entries of the entire file for a subset of entries, and the second loads entire records for the selected subset. In Myhrvold, in contrast, the data that is fed back through for the second pass is not the same data, but rather data resulting from the previous rendering process by the texture processor (Myhrvold, 10:19-28). The claimed second pass operates on the same data set, not on feedback/transform modified data output by the first pass. Further, Myhrvold is not targeting a specific subset in the subsequent pass, as recited in claim 31, but rather all rendered data. Additionally, Myhrvold is not merely a specific second pass, but rather a plurality of successive passes depending on the level of rendering transformations to be applied. (10:29-36).

Further, Myhrvold makes no showing, teaching, or disclosure of processing in which the second pass requires substantially less memory then the first pass, i.e. the claimed subset of entries. As indicated above, Myhrvold '166 performs multi-pass transformations over the rendered data. As is known in the art of image processing, such transformations refine and transmute the image to morph the image toward a final rendered product. In contrast, the claimed second pass is performed on the same set of data unmodified from the first pass. Accordingly, claim 31 has been herein amended to recite that second pass is performed on the same set of data unmodified from the first pass. The remaining independent claims 1, 17, 32, 34 and 35 , already containing limitations similar to claim 31, as discussed in previous responses, have been likewise amended to place the claims in better form for allowance.

As the remaining claims depend, either directly or indirectly, from claims 1, 17, 31, 32, 34 and 35, all claims in the case are respectfully submitted as allowable.

Applicant(s) hereby petition(s) for any extension of time which is required to maintain the pendency of this case. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, that is not covered by an enclosed check, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-3735.

If the enclosed papers or fees are considered incomplete, the Patent Office is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned collect at (508) 616-9660, in Westborough, Massachusetts.

Respectfully submitted,

Christopher J. Lutz, Esq.
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No.: 44,883
Chapin Intellectual Property Law, LLC
Westborough Office Park
1700 West Park Drive
Westborough, Massachusetts 01581
Telephone: (508) 616-9660
Facsimile: (508) 616-9661

Attorney Docket No.: EMC03-21(03115)

Dated: April 5, 2007